

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 7-11, 29-32, 51-52 and 54 without prejudice. Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43, 46-50 and 53 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 24-26, 33, 46-50 and 53 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 9 (lines 9-14) and page 12 (lines 9-13) of the instant application.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43, 46-50 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobodzinski et al. ("Lobodzinski," U.S. Patent No. 5,734,873) in view of Larson (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,199). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43, 46-50 and 53 is not anticipated or shown by Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination.

Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47

As recited in independent Claims 1 and 26, embodiments of the present invention pertain to a system or method in which the size of a character is determined according to which of a plurality of font arrays is selected. With reference to Figure 5 of the instant application, for example, a data structure 451 includes font arrays 460 and 462, where the size of the characters in one of the font arrays is larger than that of the other font array. A font pointer (or address) is used to select one of the font arrays; thus, the size of the character is determined according to which of the font arrays is selected.

Applicant respectfully submits that this claimed feature is not shown or suggested by Lobodzinski. For example, Lobodzinski in Table I and at column 5 (lines 44-46) describes a height register that is used to specify the height of a character.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski does not show or suggest that “width and height information for the character is located in the font array using the address and the index in combination, wherein the size of the character is determined according to which of the font arrays is selected” as recited in independent Claim 1, nor does Lobodzinski show or suggest “a plurality of font arrays, wherein the font arrays comprise a first font array for characters and a second font array for the characters, wherein the size of the font characters in the first font array is different from the size of the font characters in the second font array; [and] selecting one of the first and second font arrays using an address specified in a first register of a graphics controller such that the size of a character in the font is determined according to the address specified” as recited in independent Claim 26.

Applicant further submits that Larson does not overcome the shortcomings of Lobodzinski. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that Larson, alone or in combination with Lobodzinski, does not show or suggest the claim limitations cited above.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 26. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the

basis for rejecting Claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claims 1 and 26 are in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the basis for rejecting Claims 2-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-25, 27-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, as Claims 2-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-25, 27-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43 and 46-47 are dependent on either Claim 1 or 26 and recite additional limitations.

Claims 48-50 and 53

As recited in independent Claim 48, embodiments of the present invention pertain to a system in which a central processing unit provides only limited information to a graphics controller. Specifically, according to Claim 48, “to render the character the central processing unit is required to transfer to the graphics controller only an index value for the character, an x-value indicating a horizontal position for the character and a y-value indicating a vertical position for the character” (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that this claimed feature is not shown or suggested by Lobodzinski. Applicant further submits that Larson does not overcome the shortcomings of Lobodzinski. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that Larson, alone or in combination with Lobodzinski, does not show or suggest the claim limitation cited above.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claim 48 is in condition for allowance. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the basis for

rejecting Claims 49-50 and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, as Claims 49-50 and 53 are dependent on Claim 48 and recite additional limitations.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-6, 12-13, 16-20, 24-28, 33-36, 39, 41-43, 46-50 and 53 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Date: 11/23/05

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060